

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/751,113 | 12/29/2000 | Tomoko Terakado | 208366US6 CONT | 6754 |
| 22850 7 | 590 03/22/2005 | | EXAMINER | |
| OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET | | | SAJOUS, WESNER | |
| | ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | • | | 2676 | |

DATE MAILED: 03/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| <u> </u> | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | |
| Advisory Action | 09/751,113 | TERAKADO ET AL. | | | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | | | |
| | Sajous Wesner | 2676 | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the d | correspondence address | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 06 December 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. | | | | | |
| PERIOD FOR RE | PLY [check either a) or b)] | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). | | | | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | | | | | |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. | | | | | |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because: | | | | | |
| (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); | | | | | |
| (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below); | | | | | |
| (c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or | | | | | |
| (d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: | | | | | |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject | etion(s): | | | | |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | be allowable if submitted in a s | separate, timely filed amendment | | | |
| .⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet. | | | | | |
| ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. | | | | | |
| .⊠ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. | | | | | |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>33-34, 37-57, 60-71, 74-84, 87-96, and 99-119</u> . | | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | | | |
| 8. The drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner. | | | | | |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s) | | | | | |
| 10. Other: interview Summary | Mou | to Bella | | | |
| | | SACTION O DELLA | | | |

MATTHEW C. BELLA SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600 Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Applicant's arguments are deemed persuasive. It is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., storing information received at the remote control device from an external input) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns,. Further, since In Goldstein the remote controller 5 has a memory RAM 90 for storing information. At fig. 17, item 262 that is configured to write messages to RAM. And, as stated in the Applicant's response, the RAM 90 is used to store additional information or messages that is downloaded to the remote control device, it is the Examiner's interpretation that the downloaded information message corresponds to advertising information since part of Goldstein's concerns is to transmit consumer products to the user using a remote controller. See abstract and col. 12, lines 14-33). Further, since Holman meets the deficiency of Goldstein, and like Goldstein, Holman uses a remote control to present advertisement information to a user; Holman is therefore combinable with the Goldstein reference.